

Relative Clauses in Ten Plays of Platus

by Alrede Lindley Hornor

1913

Submitted to the Department of Ancient Languages
of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TEN PLAYS OF PLAUTUS

A Thesis

Submitted to the Department of Ancient Languages

of the

University of Kansas

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the

Degree of Master of Arts

by

Alfrede Lindley Hornor, A.B. 1912 Friends University

June 1913

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Introduction, Statement of Purpose and Method of | |
| Procedure..... | 1 |
| Criticism of Grammarians on Characterizing Clauses | |
| Lane..... | 4 |
| Gildersleeve..... | 6 |
| Allen and Grenough..... | 8 |
| Bennett..... | 11 |
| Hale on Characterizing Clauses..... | 15 |
| Definition of Clauses..... | 19 |
| Test of Hale's Statement of Plautine Usage..... | 24 |
| Discussion and Data. Characterizing Clauses..... | 26 |
| Grammarians on Causal Clauses..... | 40 |
| Hale on Causal Clauses..... | 43 |
| Discussion and Data. Causal Clauses | |
| Subjunctive..... | 45 |
| Indicative..... | 51 |
| "Nil Habet Quod Det"..... | 57 |
| Data | 60 |

INTRODUCTION

In all the field of syntax, the so-called Characterizing or Qualitative clause has proved a stumbling block even to the most wary. Although grammarians and syntacticians have attempted to segregate it from the other relative clauses, none, as yet, have succeeded in corraling it off from the other species which bear a close enough resemblance to slip through the bars.

This Characterizing or Qualitative clause is of the type,--"There are some who think"; "There is no one who dares"; "Caesar was a man who"; "Who is there who"; "He was the only one who" etc. In all these cases the relative clause is necessary to complete its antecedent so that the sentence can express a complete thought. The other species of relative clauses, which the definers have failed to fence out are of three kinds. "He is the man of whom I spoke." Here the relative clause tells what man is meant, and such a clause has been termed by the grammarians, a Determinative clause. In the sentence "All who believe this are mistaken," the relative clause is a so-called Generalizing clause. It has a conditional force, as it implies "if any people believe this." The third type,--"Your father, an eminent man, who loved his country" is a clause which Hale calls a Free Descriptive clause but for which most of the grammarians

or action expressed in the main clause.

The expression Subjunctive of Actuality as used in this paper refers to that use of the mode in which it has gained the force of the Indicative. This use is found in Characterizing and Result clauses and in Indirect Discourse.

LANE ON CHARACTERIZING CLAUSES

In discussing this construction Lane makes no attempt to cover the ground by the formulation of a single rule. He makes two statements, one of which includes those clauses consecutive in force, and another which includes those after statements and questions of existence and non-existence. In Section 1818 he says, "Relative sentences of characteristic or Result are equivalent to Subjunctive sentences introduced by ut, 'so as to' 'so that'." In 1822 he makes a second statement concerning these clauses. "Relative sentences after assertions or questions of non-existence take the subjunctive." This is qualified by 1823 where he states that "the Indicative, however, is not infrequently found in affirmative sentences, particularly in old Latin and poetry."

The expression "not infrequently" is typical of the evasions of the syntacticians as to the relative number of Subjunctives and Indicatives after expressions like "sunt qui" etc. Lane also includes here those "nihil est quod" clauses where the "quod" is the object of the subordinate verb. Tenny Frank denies that these can be true Characterizing clauses. This type will be discussed in the last part of this paper.

On the whole, Lane's statement of the facts concerning the Characterizing clauses is sane and conservative. Al-

though he fails to commit himself on the usage after "sunt qui," that discrepancy is shared by his fellow-grammarians.

Lane differs from some of the other grammarians in that he does not involve himself by trying to say too much. His two simple statements obviate the necessity of long periodic sentences which let in the Determinative and Generalizing clauses by their vague wording.

GILDERSLEEVE

In his grammar Gildersleeve classes all clauses of Characteristic as "potential," meaning that type which Hale calls Ideal Certainty. Gildersleeve's statement is: "Potential Relative sentences are put in the Subjunctive of Tendency when 'qui' equals 'ut is'.". This does not take into account any clause having the force of Hale's Actuality clauses. Like Lane, too, Gildersleeve's expression that "qui equals ut is" is misleading, as it suggests that the two expressions are used interchangeably in Latin. This is far from the case. "Ut" in these sentences is very rare and "qui" the almost invariable expression.

Under the general statement quoted in the preceding paragraph, four sub-divisions are made. One of these is styled after a "definite antecedent." The example given is "Solus es, C. Caesar, cuius in victoria ceciderit nemo." This he himself translates as "Thou art the only one, Caesar, in whose victory no one has fallen." Therefore, on the authority of his own interpretation, not "Caesar" but "Solus" is the antecedent of the clause and therefore this is no exception to the rule of indefinite antecedent.

In this same section Gildersleeve includes clauses following "idoneus," "aptus" etc., clauses which Hale classes as Obligation and Propriety. With reference to the clauses

after "sunt qui" etc., the difference in mode is accounted for as due to the meaning of the clause itself. This is similar to the statement made by Allen and Grenough. Here Gildersleeve says that the Indicative may be used in statements of definite facts but not of general characteristics. To illustrate the latter type he uses the sentence, "Multi sunt qui eripiant" which he himself translates "There are many to snatch away," thus plainly labelling it a relative clause of purpose and not a clause of the type under discussion at all. Hale would doubtless maintain that this clause could equally well be translated "There are many who are snatching away" or "There are many who do snatch away," thus making it a Subjunctive of Actuality, which has the force of the Indicative, "Multi sunt qui eripiunt." This seems to be a purely subjective distinction on Gildersleeve's part, which cannot be proved by examples.

Gildersleeve, like most of the other grammarians, classes the "nihil est quod" type with the Characterizing clause. This idiom will be treated separately.

ALLEN AND GRENOUGH

The definition of these clauses given by Allen and Grenough is: "Relative clauses in the Subjunctive are often used to indicate a characteristic of the antecedent, especially where the antecedent is otherwise undefined." The expression "often used to indicate a characteristic of the antecedent" applies equally well to the Determinative and Generalizing clauses, which are regularly Indicative. The statement that the Subjunctive is used "often" allows the impression that the Indicative may be used in the rest of the instances, and yet makes no distinction as to where either mood is properly used in these clauses. The statement that this type of clause occurs "especially where the antecedent is otherwise undefined" is very misleading. If it is especially true when the antecedent is undefined, the implication is that sometimes these clauses occur when the antecedent is already defined. This "especially" calls in question whether or not these are all essential clauses, which is one of the primary facts concerning Qualitative clauses.

In the prefatory note by Morris the situation is not entirely remedied. He says that the Indicative relative clause "merely states something as a fact" with fact italicized as if it were the important word. That it is a fact does not differentiate it from the Subjunctive clause of

Actuality. The statement is also made that a "Characterizing clause in the Subjunctive defines the antecedent as a person of such a character that the statement made is true of him and of all others belonging to the same class." The phrase "all others belonging to the same class" lets in the Generalizing clause, which is regularly Indicative.

To illustrate his theory that the Characterizing clause "defines the antecedent as a person of such a character," Morris takes a Generalizing clause from the "Manilian Law": "Non potest exercitum is continere imperator qui se ipse non continet." This, he says, means simply "That commander who does not restrain himself cannot restrain his army." Based on this example he coins the sentence "Non potest exercitum is continere imperator qui se ipse non contineat," which he says would mean "That commander who is not such a man as to restrain himself" etc. However, he was obviously unable to find such a clause in the Latin, and English examples translated into Latin do not furnish evidence for syntactical argument.

Morris attributes the origin of the Characterizing clause to the Potential Subjunctive, evidently referring to Hale's Ideal Certainty and Bennett's and Elmer's Contingent Futurity. He cites the Characterizing clause as the genesis of Result clauses and yet makes no mention of a consecutive origin for the Characterizing clauses themselves.

In this grammar the clauses of the type "nihil est quod timeas" of Obligation and Propriety are included under Characterizing as are also the restrictive and causal clauses. These latter clauses will be treated later as to their origin and connection with the Characterizing clause.

The Subjunctive is given as the prevailing construction after "sunt qui" but that "the Indicative sometimes occurs." The difference of mode in clauses after partially defined antecedents such as "multi," "quidam" etc. is explained as depending on the shade of meaning the writer intended to convey. This statement is explained only by two examples.

"Sunt bestiae quaedam in quibus inest aliquid simile virtutis."

"Inventi multi sunt qui vitam profundere pro patria parati essent."

These two examples are of entirely different types. The former is a clause following an expression of existence. The latter is of the "reperire" type which seems to be always Subjunctive and often has such a strong Volitive tinge as to be almost purpose.

BENNETT

Bennett's treatment of the Characterizing clause varies in his different works. In his "Latin Language" he states that it is a development from the Contingent Futurity, which is the name given by him to that modal force which Hale terms Ideal Certainty. According to Bennett the origin of the construction was confined to words such as "possim," "velim," "nolim," "malim," "andeam," "credam," "putem" etc., following negative expressions. In all these cases the notion of contingency is so slight as easily to disappear, leaving the relative clause essentially one denoting a fact.

This explanation is exactly opposed to the one Hale gives, in that Hale puts the emphasis on the negative in the transition from Ideal Certainty to Actuality, while Bennett attributes the shift to the meanings of the particular verbs named. From this discussion however, it seems that Bennett had read Hale, although he does not mention him.

In his later and presumably complete work on "Early Latin Syntax", he gives an accurate reference to the page in Hale's "Cum Constructions" on which Hale discusses the origin of the construction. Yet Bennett here attributes the shift from Contingent Futurity to Actuality solely to the meaning of the class of verbs "malim, velim, possim" etc.,

in which the potential force is so slight that it easily passes over into a statement of fact. He does not even mention the negative, on which Hale bases the whole transition. Neither does he mention the consecutive force on which Hale dwells.

Whether Bennett, at the time he wrote this discussion, had forgotten Hale's treatment of the Subjunctive in these clauses and took a hasty glance at it which failed to recall it completely, or whether he intentionally discarded the discussion to which he refers, is not clear. At any rate, if the latter is the case, he gives no reasons for so doing, nor does he give any satisfactory explanation to take its place.

Although in his "Latin Language" he explains the Result clause as a development of the Characterizing clause, he makes no mention of a consecutive force in the origin of the Characterizing clause, other than is implied in the force of the Contingent Futurity. To make the connection clear, the consecutive force of the latter clause should be emphasized.

In his "Syntax of Early Latin," Characterizing clauses are treated under the general heading of "Descriptive Clauses." This seems somewhat of a misnomer, as it includes the non-essential Indicative descriptive clause as well. Hale obviates this difficulty by his term Free Descriptive

but Bennett uses no such term to separate the two types, and therefore the general term embraces both types.

In the first paragraph, Bennett makes the statement that "Descriptive clauses are opposed to Determinative clauses which simply add another fact or item with regard to a person or thing." In attempting to define a Determinative clause, he has formulated an excellent working definition of a Parenthetical clause, the very type to which the Determinative clause is diametrically opposed, as the one is essential, the other non-essential.

In his formal classification of the types of Characterizing clauses by antecedents, Bennett consistently omits the "est," "existit" etc. which predicates the clause and so makes it Characterizing rather than Generalizing or Determinative. "Nullus qui" would invariably introduce a Generalizing clause, while "is qui" may introduce either a Determinative or a Generalizing clause but never a Characterizing clause.

The "nihil est quod" type is included with the Characterizing clauses. This is done by most of the grammarians. The Indicative is given as the "regular" construction after "sunt qui."

This book is supposed to supplant Holtze, to do all that Holtze failed to do and therefore is presumably the last word on the syntax of Early Latin. Yet even a super-

ficial study reveals not only the incompleteness of the examples but many inaccuracies of statement and classification. Although even an amateur student of syntax realizes the vastness of the field to be covered by such a work, and the task it must have been to even partially cover the ground, it cannot but seem a mistake that the book should claim to accomplish an Herculean labor which it has signally failed to perform.

HALE

The discussion of the Characterizing clause on which this paper is based is Hale's. While other grammarians generally classify Characterizing clauses formally, on the basis of their various antecedents, Hale's classification is functional. He divides them into five groups, in one of which he finds an inherent reason for the mode. This type therefore, is taken as the origin of the other four. Its verb is of such a sort that it could stand in an independent sentence of Ideal Certainty. The example which he uses to illustrate is "Nihil ecastor est quod facere mavelim" (Plautus. As. 868) and here the verb is exactly the same as it would be in the independent sentence, "Nihil facere mavelim." From this type then, he traces the development.

This original type a, characterizes its antecedent by stating some act that naturally would follow upon the character of the antecedent. Then the first step, which brought about type b, was the natural confusion between something that would invariably happen and something that does invariably happen. This shift probably came about after negative antecedents. In sentences like "There was no one who would come" the process is very plain, and sentences of this sort are numerous in Early Latin. If there was no one who would come, naturally there was no one who came. Thus

the Subjunctive entered into competition with the Indicative in statements of fact. This change gradually spread from clauses after a negative to clauses after an interrogative implying a negative, to indefinites bordering on the negative, and finally to clauses after indefinites of every kind. This last step was not accomplished until the time of Cicero, and even after that the Indicative was again freely used in such clauses in Later Latin.

After type b, the next step in development is the power gained by the Qualitative clause of characterizing its antecedent by stating the existence or non-existence in it of some quality. This marks the break away from the consecutive idea of the original clause.

From this type c, the step is easy to d, the clause which characterizes by stating some experience coming from an entirely external source, and not in any sense due to the nature of the antecedent. All resemblance to a consecutive force has been lost and type e, the Restrictive clause follows close upon the heels of this preceding force. The restrictive clause merely classifies the antecedent by some external circumstance. This construction verges upon the province of the Determinative clause and was one of the places where the barrier between the kinds of essential clauses threatened to break. Yet the subjunctive scarcely gained a foot-hold here. Another point of Subjunctive in-

vasion was after indefinites such as "quidam" "ecquis" etc, when used evidently of a definite person or thing. The Subjunctive is found here in Plautus (Hale does not give the proportion of the two modes) but its spread was checked by the non-essential clauses.

Of course these five steps of development were in no sense sharply defined. This is intended only as a theoretical outline of the probable growth of the construction, which, since it was a growth, cannot be bounded by set temporal lines.

However, in this discussion, Hale states that he has assumed "as every one does" that the use of the Subjunctive in sentences of the type "Nullus est qui" was due to a consecutive feeling. This he neither explains nor attempts to prove. As this statement is in no way led up to by the preceding discussion, it leaves a gap in the argument which injures the logical continuity of his thesis. That "qui" evidently was capable of functioning as a consecutive connective in clauses after an adjective seems undeniable, but that, of itself, it was used to express the idea "of such a sort that" seems problematical unless examples can be produced.

His statement that these clauses are in effect complex adjectives fails to differentiate them from the non-

essential descriptive clause. This difficulty is obviated later on by his supplementary statement that Characterizing clauses act as predicative adjectives. This expression, however, is not entirely satisfactory, especially from the standpoint of the secondary pupil, as some of these clauses show no obvious similarity to a word used to describe.

DEFINITION OF CLAUSES

Working upon Hale's theory, supplemented by his treatment of relative clauses in his grammar, a test of the classification of all relative clauses was made by the reading of four plays of Plautus. The clauses adapted themselves very readily to the divisions suggested by Hale, and from the results obtained, the following rules were formulated, which are in some cases a modification of Hale's in others substantially his, with little alteration.

Relative clauses as a whole may be divided into Essential and non-Essential clauses. An essential clause is one used to complete an antecedent of such a sort that, if left unexplained, the sense of the sentence would be incomplete. The objection to the expression "indefinite antecedent", which is used so often in this definition, is shown by this example. In the sentence, "Some say that this is not true", although the "some" is indefinite, a complete thought is expressed without modifying the "some." There is therefore no necessity for an essential clause.

The fact that the incompleteness must lie in the antecedent is shown by sentences such as "Miss Brown, who spoke on this question, was very much opposed to it." Here the antecedent is complete, yet the sense of the sentence would be incomplete without the non-essential clause,

A non-essential clause is one which merely adds another fact about an antecedent which is already complete. Such a clause may be important or even necessary to the sentence, as in the example used above: "Miss Brown, who spoke on this question, was very much opposed to it."

ESSENTIAL CLAUSES

A Determinative clause points out what person or thing its antecedent is.

Example: The man who lives in that house is a Mason.

A Generalizing relative clause expresses a general condition and completes a general antecedent expressed or understood. It has the Indicative mode if the condition expressed is a simple condition. The mode is Subjunctive if the corresponding "si" condition would take the Subjunctive.

Example. "No one who lives for himself alone is happy." This is equivalent to "No one is happy, if he lives for himself alone."

Characterizing Clauses are developed from two main sources, the relative clause after expressions of non-existence (which developed into the clause after expressions of existence) and the consecutive clause of Plautine usage, occurring after an adjective or an adjective with "tam".

From these two sources the construction spread into clauses which cannot be traced definitely to either origin, but seem the result of a fusion of the two influences.

Example. There was no one who wished to go. (Non-existence)

He was so poor that he (who) could not afford it. (Consecutive)

NON-ESSENTIAL CLAUSES

I. A parenthetical clause merely states another fact concerning an antecedent already complete.

A. An Aside is a parenthetical clause which merely adds another statement which is of interest by the way. It may even carry the reader's mind away from the main thought of the sentence.

Example. Mr. C.D. Green, a prominent and influential citizen, interested in all progressive movements (who, by the way, ran for mayor last year) will speak on Woman's Suffrage this evening." Such a clause as this is really an independent sentence.

B. A Free Descriptive clause is a parenthetical clause which describes its antecedent.

Example. Prof. Smith, instructor in Physical Science, who is well-informed on such subjects, be-

believes in the theory.

(1) A Tacit causal clause is a Free Descriptive clause which implies a ground of judgment for the statement made in the main clause.

Example. I, who understand the circumstances, "stay not on the order of my going, but go at once".

C. A Subjunctive causal clause is a parenthetical clause which expresses the ground of judgment for the statement made in the main clause.

Example. You made a mistake, because you let that chance slip.

II. Forward moving relative clauses advance the narrative just as does a co-ordinate clause or an independent sentence introduced by a co-ordinating conjunction. The "qui", "quod", etc., introducing these clauses, may be translated "and he", "and this".

Example. You said you hoped he would come: which thing has happened. Or freely "and this has happened."

A. A Descriptive forward-moving clause is a forward-moving clause which describes its antecedent. It is purposely loosely attached and except for that fact might have been in the Subjunctive.

Example. "There is only one man who understands the circumstances; who is too indolent to resist

them" or "and he is too indolent to resist them." In this sentence the clause "who understands" is an essential clause and therefore would be Subjunctive, the "who is too indolent" etc. would be an Indicative clause of the type under discussion.

TEST OF HALE'S STATEMENT OF PLAUTINE USAGE

Hale's statement of the usage at the time of Plautus, which the examples quoted in this paper are designed to test, is as follows:

"The Subjunctive is always used in qui-clauses expressing the result of an adjective modified by tam etc; i.e. it is the already established mode where the consecutive idea is clear. It is always used in relative clauses after phrases like nullus est qui; while after phrases like si quis est qui it is not yet fixed (Terence has a case of the Indicative), and after phrases like sunt qui and est qui, the Indicative is the commoner mode."

In one half of the plays of Plautus there are 8 instances of a relative clause following "tam" or "tanta" expressed and in all of these the Subjunctive is used. In two other cases, one after a comparative adjective and another where "tam" and an adjective are understood, the Subjunctive occurs. This bears out Hale's statement that the Subjunctive is always used where the consecutive force is clear.

In these same plays 28 clauses after expressions of non-existence occur, in 7 of which there is some force of the Subjunctive other than Actuality or Ideal Certainty. In 16 cases however, the force is clearly that of Actuality,

while 5 cases are Ideal Certainty. There is no example of the Indicative in a clause of this type.

Only 3 "si quis est qui" clauses occur in these plays. All of these are Subjunctive, although one is a potential, and another may be due to Attraction. Since the examples are so few, they scarcely suffice as a test whether or not the usage was "not yet fixed" as Hale says.

After "est qui", "sunt qui" etc., Hale merely states that the Indicative is the commoner mode. The ten plays read furnished 16 examples in all. Of these 8 were Indicative, 8 Subjunctive. In 2 cases the Subjunctive is due to Ideal Certainty and in 4 cases to Obligation or Propriety. Two examples seem to have the force of Actuality. This makes the ratio of Indicatives to Subjunctives in statements of fact as 8:2 or the Indicative occurs four times as often as the Subjunctive, when there is no inherent reason for the latter mode. This statement excludes the potential clauses of the "est quod" type, which are treated in the last section of this paper.

DISCUSSION AND DATA CHARACTERIZING CLAUSES

This research, based on the theory advanced by Hale, has indicated that Characterizing clauses have developed from two main sources; the relative clause after expressions of non-existence, as "nullus est qui" (which developed into statements of existence as well, as "sunt qui"), and the consecutive relative clause of Plautine usage occurring after an adjective or an adjective with "tam." From these two sources, the clauses had already, at the time of Plautus developed until many examples cannot be explained as coming from either one of the two sources, but seem a result of a sort of fusion of the two influences.

These clauses are all essential clauses. They differ, however, from the Indicative essential clauses in that, unlike the Determinative clause, their primary purpose is not to point out, and unlike the Generalizing, it is not to assume a fact. Neither is it, in spite of the name, to characterize or qualify, as many of the clauses do neither. In the sentence, "There are some who think," the "who think" is used, not to describe but only to complete. The antecedent of a Characterizing clause must be indefinite but cannot be general, for in the latter case a Generalizing clause is required.

Thus, by process of elimination, an essential relative clause which is neither a Determinative nor a Generalizing

clause is a Characterizing or Qualitative clause. These latter clauses cannot be more definitely defined, because they are the result of a growth and spread from the two original types before-mentioned. The many forms these clauses assume cannot be bounded by the confines of a single rule.

The validity of the theory which attributes these clauses to the two sources mentioned, is indicated by the fact that these two types of clause are the only purely Characterizing clauses which are consistently Subjunctive, with no Indicative exceptions. The majority of the examples are Ideal Certainty and Actuality, while the other forces of the mode are in the minority. Of the 28 cases after a negative 16 are, in my opinion, Actuality, 5 ideal Certainty, 3 Obligation or Propriety, 2 Potential and 2 Anticipatory. Of the "tam" type 5 are Actuality, 3 Ideal Certainty, 1 Potential and 1 Anticipatory. The Potential example (Capt. 280) is classed by Tenny Frank among the "habeo quod" type, but it seems to fit the context better if "tam" and an adjective is supplied. The Anticipatory example (Capt. 180) occurs after a comparative adjective. These two examples are quoted last in this group.

The Subjunctive in the "reperire" type is due to the strong Volitive tinge of the clause. The "nulla causa est quin" clauses of Obligation or Propriety, as classified by Tenny Frank, are included in the list of examples.

The explanation of the "quod sciam" clauses which is given by Hale is the most plausible which has yet been advanced. He claims that the fact that these clauses occurred originally after a negative made them Subjunctive (as in the case of the Characterizing clause), and that later they occurred after an affirmative, but retained the mode. Of the 4 examples found 3 occur after a negative. The last example quoted under this type is, according to Hale, the only restrictive clause with the Subjunctive found in Plautus, except the "quod sciam" ones.

The examples are quoted under formal classifications, with the exception of the last two groups. Of these, the first group illustrates the broad development of the construction, as the examples cannot be included under an fixed classes of antecedents. The last group is composed of notable examples which are apparent exceptions to rule. A discussion of this latter group follows the examples themselves.

The examples quoted are based on Ritschel's text, and with the exception of one "si quis est qui" example, all cases influenced by attraction or Indirect Discourse are excluded. This is quoted because the examples of this type were so few. The plays read were: Captivi, Trinummus, Rudens, Epidicus, Asinaria, Persa, Truculentus, Mercator, Curculio and Bacchides.

EXAMPLES CHARACTERIZING CLAUSES

AFTER EXPRESSIONS OF NON-EXISTENCE

Nihil ecastor est quod facere mavelim. Asin. 877

Nihil est quod malim. Bacch. 874

Nihil est lucri quod me hodie facere mavelim. Bacch.
859

Nec quisquam est mi aequè melius quod velim. Capt. 700

Neque gnatus neque progignetur neque potest reperiri,
quod ego dictum aut factum melius quam bonae meae Veneri
velim. Truc. 700

Nullumne interea nactus qui posset. Capt. 154

Tum autem Syrorum genus quod patientissimum hominum,
nemo exstat qui ibi sex menses vixerit. Trin. 543

Post mortem in morte nihil est quod metuam mali.
Capt. 741

Uxorem quoque ipsam hanc rem uti celes face. Nam pol
tacere numquam quicquamst quod queat. Trin. 800

Profecto nemo est quem iam dehinc metuam mihi. Asin. 111

Nemo etiam me accusavit merito meo, neque me est Athenis
alter hodie quisquam quod credi recte aequè putent. Asin. 493

Nam numquam quisquam meorum maiorum fuit, quin paris-
itando paverint ventris suos. Pers. 56

Populo praesente: Nullus est Ephesi, quin sciat. Bacch. 336

Nullus est quod non invidiant rem secundam optingere.
Bacch. 543

Nihil est illorum, quin ego illi dixerim. Bacch. 1012

Inpetrabiliior qui vivat nullus est. Merc. 605

Amiciior mihi nullus vivit atque is est qui illam habet;
nequest quoi magis me melius velle aequom siet. Merc. 897

Neque umquam quisquamst, quoinis ille ager fuit, quin
pessume ei res vorterit. Trin. 533

Virgo atque mulier nulla erit, quin sit mala quae ret-
icet. Pers. 367

Virgo atque mulier nulla erit, quin sit mala quae sap-
iet. Pers. 365

Nil est de signo quod vereare. Trin. 808

Nam isti quod suscenseam ipsi nihil est. Asin. 146

Nihil est iam, quod tu mihi suscenseas. Merc. 317

Nulla diva anculast, quae salutem adferat. Rud. 666

Neque exitium exitio est neque adeo spes, quae mi hunc
aspellat metum. Capt. 519

Spectatores ad pudicos mores facta haec fabulast neque
in hac subigitationes sunt nec argenti circumductio neque
ubi amans adulescens -- liberet. Capt. 1032

Neque ieiuniosiorum neque magis ecfertum fame vidi nec
quoi minus procedat quidquid facere occeperit. Capt. 466

Homo me miserior nullus est aequae, opinor, neque ad-
vorsa quoi plura sint sempiterna. Merc. 336

TAM TYPE

Numquam erit tam avarus quin te gratiis emittat manu.
Capt. 408

An ille tam esset stultus qui mihi mille nummum cred-
eret. Trin. 955

Quis homost tanta confidentia qui sacerdotem audeat
violare? Rud. 645

Neque nunc quisquamst tam opulentus, qui mi obsistat
in via. Curc. 284

Nec strategus nec tyrannus quisquam -- cum tanta gloria
quin cadat, quin capite sistat in via. Curc. 287

Nec quisquamst tam ingenio duro nec tam firmo pectore
quin sibi faciat bene. Asin. 945

Nam generi lenonio numquam ullus deus tam benignus
fuit qui fuerit propitius. Pers. 583

Qui tam infacetu's, Lemno adveniens qui tuae non des
amicae, Diniarche, savium? Truc. 355

Quid divitiae, sunt opimae? Unde excoquat sebum
senex. Capt. 280

Nisi qui meliorem adferet quae mi atque amicis placeat
condicio magis. Capt. 180.

EST QUI TYPE

Nam sunt ex te quae solo scitari volo. Capt. 263

Est profecto deus qui auditque et videt. Capt. 313

Sunt quos scio esse amicos. Trin. 91

Sunt quos suspicior. Trin. 91

Atque edepol sunt res quas propter tibi suscensui.

Trin. 1164

Sub veteribus ibi sunt qui dant quique accipiunt.

Curc. 480

Soror, est quod te volo secreto. Bacch. 1149

In Tusco vico ibi sunt homines qui ipsi sese venditant.

Curc. 482

Est etiam ubi profecto damnum praestet facere quam
lucrum. Capt. 327

In Velabro vel pistorem vel lanium vel haruspicem vel
qui ipsi vortant vel qui aliis, ut vorsentur, praebeant.

Curc. 484

Sed etiam est paucis vos quod monitos voluerim, Capt. 53

Pone aedem Castoris ibi sunt subito quibus credas male.

Curc. 481

Tu si animum vicisti potius quam animus te, est quod
gaudeas. Trin. 310

Bonamst quod habeas gratiam merito mihi, qui te ex
insulso salsum feci opera mea, Rud. 516

Sunt tamen quos miseros maleque habeas. Trin. 268

Si id mea voluptate factumst, est quod mihi suscenseas.

Trin. 1166

QUIS EST QUI TYPE

Quis homost qui dicat me dixisse? Bacch. 807

Quis mest mortalis miserior qui vivat alter hodie?

Rud. 1281

Quae mihist spes qua me vivere velim? Rud. 209

Quid est quod caveam? Rud. 833

Quid est quod pudendum siet, genere natam bono pauperem
te domum ducere uxorem. Epid. 168

Quid est quod metuas? Pers. 238

Quid est quod metuas? Bacch. 92

Quid est quod pudeat? Bacch. 1156

Quid est quod vobis pessumae haec malefecerint? Truc.
295

Idne pudet te, quia captivam genere progeneratam bono de
praeda's mercatus? Quis erit vito qui id vortat tibi? *Epid. 108*

SI QUIS EST QUI

Do tibi operam, Aristophantes, si quis est quod me
velis. Capt. 618

Si quid hominist miseriarum, quod miserescat miser ex
animo, id ego experior. Epid. 526

Si quid tibi placeat quod illi congestum siet, edisne
an incenatus cum opulento accubes? Trin. 472

AFTER INDEFINITES

Vah, solus hic homost qui sciat divinitus. Curc. 248

Pol ego magis unum quaero, meas quoi praedicem. Epid. 454.

Tum autem sunt alii qui te volturium vocant, Trin. 161

Eadem postquam alium repperit qui plus daret. Truc. 81

Haben tu amicum aut familiarem quempiam quoi pectus
sapiat? Trin. 89

Si quidpiamst minus quod bene esse lautum tu arbitrare.

Rud. 701

Numquam hominem quemquam conveni, unde abierim lubent-
ius, Epid. 80

Quippe tu me aliquid aliquo modo alicunde ab aliquibus
blatis, quod nusquam gentiumst, Epid. 335

Num tu pudicae quoipiam insidias locas aut quam pudicam
oportet esse. Curc. 26

Ne penetrarem me usquam ubi esset damni conciliabolum.
Trin. 314

Nec quemquam interim istoc ad nos qui sit odio mittam
intro, Truc. 717

Sane haud quidquamst magis quod cupiam iamdiu. Curc. 171

Aut aliquem nuntium qui hinc ad se veniat, Capt. 382

Ecquem recaluum ac silonem senem -- tortis superciliis
-- deorum odium -- qui duceret mulierculas duas secum?

Rud. 320

Ecquem adulescentem nunc dum hic adstatis strenua facie
rubicundum fortem vidistis, qui tris duceret chlamydos cum
machaeris? Rud. 313

Ecquis nam deust, qui mea nunc laetus laetitia fuat?
Merc. 844

Ecquid est, quod mea referat? Rud. 949

Ecquis est qui mihi commonstret Phaedromum genium meum?
Curc. 301

Huius modi paucas poetae reperiunt comoedias ubi boni
meliores fiant, Capt. 1033

Multa eveniunt homini quae volt. Trin. 361

Multa eveniunt homini - quae nevolt. Trin. 361

Adolescens quidam est qui in hisce habitat aedibus,
Trin. 12

Quia res quaedamst quam volo ego me aps te exorare.
Trin. 324

Nam est res quaedam, quam occultabam tibi dicere. Pers. 493.

Senex est quidam qui aliquam mandavit mihi ut emerem
ad istanc faciem ancillam. Merc. 426

AFTER DIGNUS

Quia ego indignus sum, tu dignus qui sies. Rud. 523

Praesertim quom is me dignum quoi concrederet habuit.
Asin. 80

Nequior nemost, neque indignior quoi di bene faciant
neque quem quisquam homo aut amet aut adeat. Bacch. 616

REPERIRE TYPE

Tu enim repertu's, Philocratem, qui superes veriverbio.
Capt. 568

Pol ego ut rem video, tu inventu's vera veritudine qui
convincas. Capt. 569

Rus tu mi opprobras: ut nactus hominem quem pudeat
probrī! Truc. 280

Nescioquem ad portum nactus es, ubi cenes. Capt. 837

Non repperisti, adulescens, tranquillum locum, ubi
tuas virtutes explices. Epid. 440

QUOD SCIAM TYPE

Nusquam, quod sciam. Capt. 174

Non ero, quod sciam. Capt. 265

Nam equidem quod sciam numquam sensi. Truc. 200

Tantumst quod sciam. Merc. 642

Quod quidem nunc veniat in mentem mihi. Epid. 638

QUESTIONS WITH QUIN

Num quae causast quin -- viginti minas mihi des?
Capt. 353

Neque de hac re negotiumst quin male occidam. Capt. 525
 Nullam causam dico quin mihi et parentum et libertatis
 apud te deliquio siet. Capt. 625

Gaudeo, etsi nil scio quod gaudeam. Capt. 842
 Numquid causaest quin uxorem cras domum ducam? Trin.
 1188

Quid causaest, quin virgis te usque ad saturitatem
 sauciem, Rud. 758

Nulla causast quin me condones cruci. Rud. 1070
 Gratiam habeo et de talento nulla causast quin feras.
 Rud. 1397

EXAMPLES NOT CLASSIFIABLE BY ANTECEDENTS

Si in aedem ad cenam veneris -- adposita cena sit pop-
 ularem quam vocant. Trin. 470

Non placet mihi cena quae bilem movet. Bacch. 537
 Mulieres duae innocentes intus hic sunt, tui indigentes
 auxili, quibus advorsum ius legesque hic insignite iniuria
 factast. Rud. 642

Unde? Ab homine quem mi amicum esse arbitratus sum
 antidhac. Bacch. 539

Non voto ted armare qui dant quoia amentur gratia.
 Asin. 536

Licet antestari? Non licet. At ego quem licet te. Curc.
 623

An vero, quia cum frugi hominibus ibi bibisti, qui ab alieno facile cohiberent manus. Trin. 1019

Ego ubi bene sit tibi locum lepidum dabo. Bacch. 84

Garriet quoi neque pes umquam neque caput compareat. Capt. 614

Amor amari dat tamen satis quod aegre sit. Trin. 260

Vidi ego multa saepe picta quae Accherunti fierent cruciamenta. Capt. 998

Quia leno ademit cistulam ei quam habebat ubique habebat, qui suos parentis noscere potesset. Rud. 390

Ubi sunt signa qui parentis noscere haec possit suos. Rud. 1110

PECULIAR CASES

Palinurus!

Eloquere, quid est quod Palinurum voces? Curc. 166

Sed quid est quod lubet perditum dicere te esse. Curc. 135

De lanificio neminem metuo, una aetate quae sit. Merc. 520

Dotalem servom Sauream uxor tua tibi adduxit, quoi plus in manu sit quam tibi. Asin. 85

Quid id obsecrost, quod scias. Truc. 297

Nam alia memoriare, quae illum facere vidi dispudet. Bacch. 481

Eos requirunt qui lubenter reddant domi. Capt. 473

The first two examples in this group are noteworthy in that they are similar in form to the "quid est quod" clauses classified by Frank as Obligation or Propriety. Yet the first example is clearly Actuality while the second is Indicative.

The third example is a Generalizing clause into which the Subjunctive mode has crept because of its similarity in form to a Characterizing clause after a negative antecedent.

The fourth example is a Free Descriptive clause, yet Subjunctive. It illustrates the spread of the mode beyond its proper boundaries. The fifth example illustrates the same tendency to spread, this time in a Determinative clause. The context suggests no inherent reason for the mode.

The sixth is a peculiar example in that "alia" is used instead of "cetera" as the antecedent of a Determinative clause.

In the seventh example the Subjunctive is due to the Volitive force. No other clause of this sort was found in the ten plays read.

GRAMMARIANS ON CAUSAL CLAUSES

Concerning the relative causal clauses, the general statements of Lane and Gildersleeve are similar. Both say that the "qui" causal sentences with the Subjunctive are equivalent to Subjunctive sentences with "cum is." This has the same fault, however, as the statement which each makes concerning the Characterizing clause. It may imply either that the origin of the two clauses was similar or that they were used interchangeably by the Romans. Neither of these implications seems tenable. The respective origins of the two forms of causal clauses are entirely unrelated. The Subjunctive "cum" causal clauses are very rare in early Latin, the Indicative being the prevailing mode. There seems also to have been a preference for the relative causal clauses, as they far out-number the "cum" clauses, both in the Indicative and in the Subjunctive.

Lane has the advantage of Gildersleeve in admitting the causal Indicative clause. He says, "Oftentimes where a causal relative might be expected, a simple declarative Indicative is used." He gives one striking example, of a type rarely found: "Sed sumne ego stultus, qui rem curo publicam?"

Allen and Grenough class Subjunctive causal clauses as Characterizing clauses expressing cause or concession. Bennett disposes of them in the same way, calling them "des-

criptive clauses with an accessory idea of cause." His treatment varies, however. In his Appendix and also in the later "Latin Language" he admits an apparent violation of rule in that the causal clause has a definite antecedent. He obviates this by supplying an indefinite antecedent as in "O fortunate man, (one) who lives in such circumstances." He regards the Second Person Singular in these clauses as a species of attraction. Yet he gives no other examples of such attraction in Latin, nor does he offer any explanation for its occurring in these clauses and no where else in the language.

However, in his final word on the subject, in his "Syntax of Early Latin" he ignores this violation in antecedent, to which he refers in his earlier works. He offers no explanation of this omission nor is there any apparent consciousness on his part of any inconsistency. He here defines them as "Descriptive clauses with an accessory idea of cause" and considers that the causal notion develops purely as a result of the context. He also notes that the reason expressed by these clauses "is regularly not the motive or impelling cause of action but the ground of the assertion made by the speaker." He states that in the majority of cases, these clauses are in the first or second persons. The reason for such an arrangement is not apparent, as he makes no point by it and there seems none to be

made.

Bennett admits that the Indicative "is not infrequent in similar clauses" and that it is also found in clauses adversative in force. However, he gives no hint as to the relative frequency with which the two modes occur in Early Latin.

HALE ON CAUSAL CLAUSES

Hale traces the Subjunctive causal clause back to a time when "qui" was used to introduce consecutive relative clauses of Ideal Certainty after an adjective. This usage he claims, antedated the explicit consecutive use of "tam"—"qui" This clause of Ideal Certainty developed into Actuality in the same way as in the Result clause. The sentence "He was good, so that he would help you" as naturally becomes "He was good so that he helped you" as the sentence "They fought so bravely that they would conquer" becomes "They fought so bravely that they conquered.

This transition from Ideal Certainty to Actuality marks a break in the force of the clause. Although the clause is still consecutive, when the tendency becomes fact it furnishes a ground for judgment and thus a causal force. In the sentence "He was good so that he would help you" the "qui invaret" would be a consecutive clause. When it becomes "He was good so that he helped you" the subordinate clause, while still consecutive, has gained the power to express a fact which gives the speaker a reason for making the main statement, "He was good."

The type of sentence which suggested this origin to Hale is one of which many instances are found in Plautus. An example is "Quid, istae mutae sunt, quae pro se fabulari non queant?" (Rud. 1113) Such a sentence conveys two con-

ceptions. One of these is a consecutive idea,--"Are these women dumb, so that they cannot speak for themselves?" It also, however, gives the ground of judgment of the speaker -- "Are these women dumb? (I judge so) because they cannot speak for themselves."

From the frequent occurrence of this type descended from the consecutive clause, the Subjunctive came to be connected with the causal idea and so spread gradually into clauses far removed from this type. It therefore seems the connecting link between the consecutive and the pure causal clause, as it is capable of both interpretations. The large number of these clauses is strong evidence for the soundness of his theory.

Hale admits that this thesis is merely a speculation, as it goes back beyond the evidence of literature. He also admits that a few instances of the Indicative after expressions like "insanus est qui" are found, as well as causal clauses in the Subjunctive far removed from this type after an adjective.

In the light of these admissions his explanation seems plausible and the examples conform to his statement of the case,

With reference to the Indicative causal clause, Hale merely states that it exists and was freely used in Cicero but gives no idea of the relative numbers of Subjunctive and Indicative clauses in Cicero or elsewhere.

DISCUSSION OF SUBJUNCTIVE CAUSAL CLAUSES

A test of Hale's theory of the genesis of the Subjunctive Causal clause produces results which are not unfavorable testimony. In ten plays, or one-half of Plautus' works, there occur 35 instances of Subjunctive Causal clauses where the mode cannot be accounted for by attraction or Indirect Discourse. Of these 35 examples, 15 follow an adjective and may be interpreted as consecutive, while 20 are cases where no consecutive force is discernible. Five cases of the Indicative in causal clauses after an adjective are found, as opposed to the 15 cases with the Subjunctive.

These 5 Indicatives are opposed to the theory of consecutive origin, as in no case is an Indicative found in a regular consecutive clause. Yet Hale acknowledges that a few of these Indicative clauses after adjectives exist.

Admitting a consecutive force in these 15 cases of the Subjunctive after an adjective, it seems plausible that the remaining 20 might be a type resulting from a development and spread from the type after an adjective. That is, the original type may have been a development from the consecutive clause, but before Plautus' time the Subjunctive had become associated with the causal idea and so spread into clauses without any consecutive feeling. This is in substance Hale's theory.

The last eight examples quoted may be cited as indications of the proposed theory, as they show breaks between the consecutive interpretation and the "ground of judgment" interpretation. The first four of these are clauses following an adjective, yet incapable of being interpreted as consecutive. The form is the same but the consecutive force is absent.

In the next three examples (of this group of eight) the thought of the clause may be interpreted as consecutive although the clause is preceded, not by an adjective, but in two cases by a noun and in one case by a verb.

In the last quoted example the clause might either follow the adjective or give the ground of judgment for the main clause. Such cases might have brought about a confusion through which the ordinary causal developed from the type after an adjective.

The examples quoted do not include those affected by Indirect Discourse or Attraction. The five examples of Indicative clauses after an adjective are given just following the Subjunctive, in order that the similarity may be noted.

SUBJUNCTIVE CAUSAL CLAUSES AFTER AN ADJECTIVE

Satin tu's sanus mentis aut animi tui, qui condicionem hanc repudies? Trin. 454

Quis homost me insipientiorⁱ qui ipse egomet ubi sim quaeritem. Trin. 929

[Sed ego sum insipientiorⁱ qui egomet unde redeam hunc rogitem.] Trin. 937

Ne tu me edepol arbitrare beluam, qui quidem non novisse possim. Trin. 953

Sed ego sum insipientior qui rebus curem publicis. Trin. 1057

Quid, istae mutae sunt, quae pro se fabulari non queant? Rud. 1113

Iniuriu's, qui quod lenoni nullist id ab eo petas. Curc. 65

Stultior stulto fuisti, qui his tabellis crederes. Curc. 551

Sanane es, quae isti committas? Curc. 654

Stultus, qui hoc mihi daret argentum, quoⁱus ingenium noverat. Pers. 261

Sumne autem nihili, qui nequeam ingenio moderari meo? Bacch. 91

Stultus es, qui facta infecta facere verbis postules. Truc. 730

Qui - faceta's, quae ames hominem isti modi! Truc. 930
 Ego stultior, qui isti credam, quom moratur. Merc. 920
 Quid istuc? alienum es amabo, mi Strabax, qui non ex-
 templo intro ieris? Truc. 666

INDICATIVE CAUSAL AFTER AN ADJECTIVE

Sumne ego homo scelestus, qui illunc hodie excepi
 vidulum? Rud. 1184

Sumne ego homo scel^estus, qui illum hodie excepi vid-
 ulum? aut quom excepi qui non alicubi in solo abstrusi
 loco. Rud. 1185

Stultus es qui illi male aegre patere dici qui facit.
 Bacch. 464

Qui te di omnes perdant, qui me hodie oculis vidisti
 tuis, meque adeo scelestum, qui non circumspexi centiens-
 Rud. 1167

Sumne ego homo miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere?
 Merc. 588

SUBJUNCTIVE CAUSAL CLAUSES

Aut si te odit, qui istum appelles Tyndarum pro Philo-
ccrate. Capt. 546

Tibi quidem hercle quisquis es magnum malum, qui orat-
ione hic occupatos occupes. Rud. 107

Istic infortunium, qui praefestinet ubi erus adsit
praeloqui. Rud. 119

Daem. - Edepol infortunio hominem praedicas donabilem.
Trach. - Qui sacerdoti scelestus faucis interpresserit.
Rud. 655

Tum tibi hercle deos iratos esse oportet, quisquis es,
quae parentis tam in angustum tuos locum conpegeris. Rud.
1147

Id adeo qui maxime animum advorterim, pleraeque eae
sub vestimentis secum habebant retia. Epid. 215

Absurde facis qui angas te animi. Epid. 326

Quid? ego lenocinium facio, qui habeam alienas domi
atque argentum egurgitem domo prosus. Epid. 581

Verum hoc facto sese ostendit, qui quidem cum filio
potet una atque una amicam ductet decrepitus senex. Asin.
862

Quid est? quae te mala crux agitat, qui ad istunc
modum alieno viris tuas extentes ostio. Bacch. 584

Merito hoc nobis fit, qui quidem huc venerimus. Bacch.
1132

Paenitetne te quot ancillas alam, quine etiam insuper deducas? Truc. 534

EXAMPLES SHOWING POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT

1. Sed utrum tu masne an femina's, qui illum patrem voces. Rud. 102
2. Sanum es, qui puerum te esse dicas? Merc. 292
3. Heu edepol hominem infelicem qui patronam conprimat. Asin. 292
4. Miserior mulier me nec fiet nec fuit, tali viro quae nupserim. Merc. 701
5. Non me arbitratur militem, sed mulierem, qui me meosque non queam defendere. Bacch. 846
6. Non homo tu quidem es, qui istoc pacto tam lepidam inlepidè appelles. Bacch. 1169
7. Nimium scis sapere, ruri quae non manseris. Merc. 686
8. Di deaque te agitant irati, scelus, qui hanc non properes destinare. Pers. 667.

DISCUSSION OF INDICATIVE CAUSAL CLAUSES.

In the *Captivi*, *Trinummus*, *Rudens* and *Epidicus*, the ratio of Indicative or Tacit causal clauses to the Subjunctive was found to be 52 Indicative as opposed to 24 Subjunctive. Of these 24 Subjunctives, in 9 cases the mode may be due to Indirect Discourse or Attraction. Leaving these cases out of account, the Indicative causal are to the Subjunctive as 52:15, or in other words, there are about three and one-half times as many Indicative causal clauses in the four plays under consideration.

The facts in the case prove to be a far-cry from the state of affairs implied by the silence of most of the grammarians as to the existence of Indicative causal clauses. This ratio not only confirms but supplements Hale's statement that the Indicative causal clause "exists." His only other statement is that it was freely used in Cicero's time, but he gives no idea as to its use in Early Latin.

The examples of this construction which follow, are, in my opinion, Tacit Causal or Adversative, although some of the cases might not be so interpreted by everyone.

EXAMPLES INDICATIVE (TACIT) CAUSAL AND ADVERSATIVE

1. Verum hercle vero nos parsiti planius, quos numquam quisquam neque vocat neque invocat, Capt. 76
2. Alienus quom eius incommodum tam aegre feras, quid me patrem par facerest quoi illest unicus? Capt. 147
3. Fortuna humana fingit artatque ut lubet: me qui liber fueram, servom fecit, e summo infumum. Capt. 305
4. Qui imperare insueram numc altrius imperio obsequor. Capt. 306
5. Utinam te di prius perderent quam periisti e patria tua, Aristophontes, qui ex parata re inparatam omnem facis. 538 *Capt.*
6. Ad patrem huius. Quem patrem, qui servos est? Capt. 574
7. Crucior lapidem non habere me, ut illi mastigiaee cerebrum excutiam, qui me insanum verbis concinnat suis. Capt. 600
8. Immo enim vero, Hegio, istic qui volt vinciatur. Capt. 609
9. An tu fortasse fuisti meae matri obstitrix, qui id tam audacter dicere audes? Capt. 630
10. Tum igitur ego deruncinatus deartuatus sum miser huius scelesti techinis, qui me ut lubitumst ductavit dolis. Capt. 641.

11. At ego aio recte, qui aps te sorsum sentio. Capt.
710

12. Eamus intro - huic dem. Quoi peculi nihil est,
recte feceris. Capt. 1029

13. Hic illest, senecta aetate qui factust puer, qui
admisit in se culpam castigabilem. Trin. 44

14. Quid tu adolescentem, quem esse corruptum vides,
qui tuae mandatus est fide et fiduciae, quin cum restituisti?
Trin. 116

15. Atque egomet me adeo cum illis una ibidem traho:
qui illorum verbis falsis acceptor fui. Trin. 204

16. Edepol hominem praemandatum ferme familiariter
quiquidem nusquam per virtutem rem confregit atque eget.
Trin. 336

17. Em nunc hic, quocius est, ut ad incitas redactust.
Trin. 536

18. Aha, non convenit me, qui abusus sum tantum rem
patriam porro in ditiis esse agrumque habere. Trin. 681

19. Mirum quin ab avo eius aut proavo acciperem qui
sunt mortui. Trin. 967

20. Idcirco moneo vos ego hoc, qui estis boni. Rud. 28

21. Idcirco moneo vos ego hoc, qui estis boni quique
aetatem agitis cum pietate. Rud. 29

22. Heus tu qui fana ventris causa circumis, iubere
meliust prandium ornari domi. Rud. 146

23. Sed, O Palaemon, sancte Neptuni comes, qui aerumnae Herculeae socius esse diceris, quod facinus video?

Rud. 160

24. Nunc tibi amplectimur genua egentes opum, quae in locis nescius nescia spe sumus. Rud. 274

25. Omnibus modis qui pauperes sunt homines miseri vivont, praesertim quibus nec quaestus est nec didicere artem unquam ullam. Rud. 290

26. Edepol Libertas lepida's, quae numquam pedem voluisti in navem cum Hercule via imponere. Rud. 490

27. Utinam te, priusquam oculis vidissem meis malo cruciatu in Sicilia perbiteres, quem propter hoc mihi optigit misero mali, Rud. 496

28. Pol minime miror, navis si fractast tibi, scelus te et sceleste parta quae vexit bona. Rud. 506

29. Bonamst quod habeas gratiam merito mihi, qui te ex insulso salsum feci opera mea. Rud. 577

30. O scirpe, laudo fortunas tuas, qui semper servas gloriam aritudinis. Rud. 524

31. Ut fortunati sunt fabri ferrarii, qui apud carbones adsident: semper calent. Rud. 532

32. Bene equidem tibi dico, qui te digna ut eveniant precor. Rud. 640

33. Nam ego nunc mihi qui impiger fui repperi, ut piger si velim siem. Rud. 924

34. Dominus hñic, ne frustra sis, nisi ego nemo natust,
hunc qui cepi in venatu meo. Rud. 970

35. Immost profecto: ego qui sum piscator scio. Rud. 994

36. Numqui minus, si veniat nunc dominus quoiust,
ego qui inspectavi procul te hunc habere, fur sum quam tu?
Rud. 1021

37. Qui te di omnes perdant, qui me hodie oculis vid-
isti tuis. Rud. 1166

38. Age eamus, mea gnata, ad matrem tuam, quae ex te
poterit argumentis hanc rem magis exquirere. Rud. 1179.

39. Pro di immortales, quis mest fortunatior, qui ex
inproviso filiam inveni meam? Rud. 1192

40. Quis mest mortalis miserior qui vivat alter hodie,
quem ad recuperatoris modo damnavit Ples iddipus. Rud. 1282

41. Pro illo dimidio Gripum ego emittam manu, quem
propter tu vidulim et ego gnatum inveni. Rud. 1411

42. Vos priores esse oportet, nos posterius dicere,
qui plus sapitis. Epid. 262

43. Hic poterit cavere recte, iura qui et leges tenet.
Epid. 292

44. Quid illum facere vis, qui, tibi quoi divitiae
sunt maxumae, ais nummum nullum habere. Epid. 329

45. Quid illum facere vis, qui, tibi quoi divitiae
sunt maxumae, ais nummum nullum habere, Epid. 329

46. Pugnasti bene, qui me emunxist~~is~~ mucidum minumi

preti. Epid. 494

47. Quid nunc? Qui in tantis postus sum sententus
[eamne ego sinam impune?] Epid. 517

48. Si quid hominist miseriarum, quod miserescat
miser ex animo, id ego experior, quoi multa in unum locum
confluont. Epid. 527

49. Quid ego, qui illam ut preimum vidi, numquam vidi
postea. Epid. 600

50. Habe bonum animum. Epid:- Quippe ego, quoi
libertas in mundo sitast! Epid. 618

51. Quid tu, quae patrem tuom vocas me atque oscul-
aris, quid stas stupida? Epid. 582

52. Maxuma hercle iniuria vinctus adsto, quouis haec
hodie opera inventast filia. Epid. 716

"NIL HABET QUOD DET"

The idiom "(nil) habet quod det", which occurs frequently in Plautus, is generally classed by the grammarians as Characterizing. Bennett, in his "Syntax of Early Latin" puts them with the pure Relative Purpose clauses. Tenny Frank, however, in his "Semantics of Modal Constructions" throws some new light on the subject and advances a logical theory by which to account for the idiom.

He takes issue with the classification of these clauses under the Characterizing clauses, because, although like the Characterizing clauses, these expressions qualify an indefinite or negative antecedent, unlike the Characterizing clauses, they are invariably Subjunctive, while Characterizing clauses are found in the Indicative after expressions of existence and non-existence, especially in Plautus and the poets. These clauses also have a potential force which the Characterizing clause has not,

Frank therefore claims that the idiom "nil habet quod det" with "quod" used as an accusative could never have been a Characterizing clause when the action of the verb is physical and momentary in the present time. Of course in a sentence such as "There is no one here whom I hate" although "whom" is the object of "hate", the action of the verb is continued and habitual although it is present in form. In the sentence "nil habet quod edim," however, the

meaning is not "I have nothing which I am in the habit of eating" but rather "I have nothing which I can (right now) eat", or "I have nothing to eat."

On this distinction of meaning Frank bases his theory that these clauses are, for the most part, a development of the relative clause of Purpose. He also acknowledges the influence of the Deliberative Subjunctive in questions of the first person.

He shows by examples how, in proportion as the Volitive force in the main verb becomes weaker, the Potential force in the subordinate clause increases. When the Volitive force is strong in the main verb, it often over-shadows the Potential force in the subordinate clause to the extent that "Plautus finds it necessary to rescue the potential idea by the use of "possit". This is his explanation of the frequent duplication of the potential idea by the use of "possum" in these clauses.

His study of the construction is too detailed to be discussed fully here. He gives a complete list of the Plautine examples, classified as to negative and affirmative antecedents. He makes a systematic study of the development of the idiom in Latin alone and then compares the histories of similar constructions in cognate languages. The decision he reaches is that this expression is an idiom which has developed from two main sources, the Purpose

clause and Subjunctive questions of the first person. The type of question which functioned in this way is that implying helplessness and calling for an answer expressing inability as "Quid faciam?" (What can I do?) would call for the answer, "There is nothing I can do."

A study of this idiom proves that Frank is right in setting it apart from other constructions. It fits in with no other classification and the examples are so numerous as to require a classification of their own.

This is the most elaborate treatment which has been given the idiom by any syntactician, and is temptingly logical. Its weakness lies in the fact that the whole theory rests on Frank's attempted proof of the non-existence of the Potential Subjunctive. He claims that the potential force is conveyed by a combination of words rather than by the verb itself. His argument is very cleverly presented, but one cannot help but feel that proof is required which he has not given.

Hale accounts for the mode as simply due to the potential force of the clause. This explanation involves no iconoclastic abolition of a modal force and so is difficult to displace.

The examples from the ten plays read follow in the next section.

EXAMPLES "NON HABET QUOD DET"

Nihil est quo me recipiam. Capt. 103

Si non est ubi sedeas. Capt. 12

Conburas, si velis, ne illi sit cera, ubi facere
possit litteras. Asin. 767

Ubi non est scripturam unde dent. Truc. 146

Boves quos emerem non erant. Pers. 262

Non erat meretricum aliarum Athenis copia quibuscum
haberes. Bacch. 564

Nec tibi qui vivas domist. Capt. 581

Huic quod dem nusquam quicquamst. Asin. 631

Nam pol tacere numquam quicquamst quod queant. Trin. 801

Neque nummus ullust qui reddatur militi Bacch. 609

Lingua nullast qua negem. Capt 937.

Quaeso hercle, animum ne desponde. Nullust quem des-
pondeam. Merc. 614

Perficito, argentum ut habeat hodie filius, amicae
quod det. Asin. 104

Si ecastor nunc habeas quod des, alia verba prohibeas.
Asin. 188.

Nam si haec habeat aurum, quod illi renumeret, faciat
lubens. Bacch. 46

Si dederis, erit extemplo mihi quod dem tibi. Capt. 122.

Quom me adiit, ut pudentem gnatum aequomst patrem,

cupio esse amicae quod det argentum suae. Asin. 83

Si quid hominist miseriarum, quod miserescat miser ex-
animo id ego experior. Epid. 526

Utinam nunc stimulus in manu mihi sit qui latera con-
teram tua. Asin. 419

Atque ego istum agrum tibi relinqui ob eam rem enixe
expeto, tut tibi sit, qui te corrigere possis. Trin. 652

Si non ubi sedeas locus est. Capt. 12

Rem perdidisti apud vos: Si rem servassem, fuit ubi neg-
otiosus essem. Truc. 140

Si non est quod dem. Capt. 121

Si adfers, tum patent: si non est quod des, aedes non
patent. Asin. 242

Ne tu illud verbum actutum inveneris: 'Mihi quidem
hercle non est quod dem mutuom.' Trin. 761

Occlusti linguam: nil est quod respondeam. Trin. 188

Is est immunis, quod nihil est qui munus fungatur suum.
Trin. 354

Nam qui vivamus nil est. Trin. 560

Tibi quidem quod ames domi praestest-- Epid. 653

Habeo unde istuc tibi quod poscis dem. Asin. 234

Habeo dotem unde dem. Trin. 158

Deum virtute habemus et qui nosmet utamur. Trin. 355

Deum virtute habemus -- aliis qui comitati simus benev-
olentibus. Trin. 356

Aequom fuit habere speculum -- qui perspicere possent

cordis copiam Epid. 384.

Volt fieri liber, verum quod det non habet. Trin. 564.

Si negat habere quod det. Truc. 242

Nec satis accipimus, satis quom quod det non habet.

Truc. 243

Neque ubi meas spes conlocem habeo usquam munitum locum

Epid. 531.

Atque oppido hercle bene velle illud visus sum, ast
non habere quoi commendarem capram. Merc. 246

Quoniam ei qui me aleret nil video esse relicui. Trin. 14

Dedistine hoc facto ei gladium qui se occideret?

Trin. 128.

Amare oportet omnis qui quod dent habent. Truc. 76

Da mihi aliquid ubi condormiscam loci. Rud. 571.

Datin isti sellam ubi adsidat. Curc. 311.

Edepol copias, dum lingua vivet, qui rem solvas omnibus. Rud. 558.

Ego faxo haud dicet nactam, quem derideat. Bacch. 506

Faxo se haud dicat nactam quem derideat. Bacch. 864

Ne copia esset ei qui suos parentes nosceret. Rud. 393

Est relicuom quo peream magis. Asin. 233.

Et quidem reliqui in ventre cellae uni locum, ubi reliquarum reliquias reconderem. Curc. 388

Si quem reperire possit, quoi os sublinat. Trin. 557.

Neque quem rogitem responsorem quemquam interea con-

venio. Rud. 226,

Neque de illo quicquam neque emeris neque venderes nec
qui deterior esset faceres copiam. Trin. 135.

Iam te ratu's nactum hominem quem defraudares. Rud. 1387

Neve quocquam, unde ad eum id posset permanascere.

Trin. 155

Numquid est quod dicas aliud de illo Merc. 642.

Memini et scio et te me orare et mihi non esse quod
darem. Pers. 119.

Amorem multos inlexe in dispendium; intemperantem,
incogitantem, iniurium trahere exhaustiere me quod quirem
ab se domo, Merc. 53.

De mendico male meretur qui ei dat quod edit aut bibat.

Trin. 339

Miser homost, qui ipse sibi quod edit quaerit et id
aegre invenit. Capt. 461

Ille miserrumst, qui quom se rupit, quod edit non
habet. Capt. 463.

University of Kansas Libraries



3 3838 100531102